



## SSMU Council Meeting

Thursday, November 12th, 2009

**Attendance:** Ivan Neilson, Alexandra Brown, Jose Diaz, Rebecca Dooley, Sebastian Ronderos-Morgan, Pauline Gervais, Janina Grabs, Lauren Hudak, Zach Newburgh, Joshua Abaki, Mark Bay, Emil Briones, Miriam Desrosiers, Tom Fabian, Claudia Gucciardi, Daniel Keresteci, Joel Lightbound, Annie Ma, David Marshall, Corey Omer, Joel Pedneault, Gloria To, Zili Wang, Sarah Woolf, Billi Wun, Xiao Yu.

1. Call to Order ..... 6.14

Hudak: The debating procedure is as followed: First we will have a speech of affirmation, then a speech of negation. Amendment sheets are on the table. You don't have to stand at the corner, you can speak where you sit. Once you are finished, you can decide whether you want to yield to questions, yield to the floor, or yield to a friendly speaker – then, it would go to the con-side. There is no set time period for the debate, but no member can speak twice or more than 5 minutes. We would like the gallery to speak too. The direct terminology is "I move to previous question". For gallery members, you may ask questions during question period and also participate in the debate when we discuss resolutions. Priority will be given to councilors. If you haven't picked up your doc-pack, they are right over here.

Yu: I move to suspend Article 10 of by-laws about the in-camera session?

Hudak: To explain, we have passed a TV-McGill resolution, but by suspending this, it will no longer restrict the gallery from attending.

***Motion to suspend Article 10 passed.***

Hudak: We need to set an adjournment time. At this time, I will accept a motion to either set the time at midnight or to suspend it.

Bay: Motion to suspend the rules for Article 8.1.

***Motion to suspend the rules for adjournment time passed.***

2. Approval of the Minutes .....

Hudak: Are there any changes that need to be made to the last council minutes?



Marshall: Motion to approve the minutes.

***Motion to approve the minutes passed.***

3. Adoption of the Agenda .....

Hudak: I will accept a motion to suspend the rules and adopt the final agenda.

VP Dooley: Motion to adopt the final agenda.

***Motion to adopt the final agenda passed.***

4. Announcements .....

VP Brown: Next Tuesday, HMB is having a town hall from 12.30 to 2.00, and then we are having Coffee and Chat with the executives. We will have free coffee and snacks, and there will be an option to talk to us and find out what we do. Come talk to us, there is a facebook event.

VP Dooley: There will be an info session for student groups for the task force on Monday 6pm Leacock 610. Please come.

5. Question Period .....

No questions.

6. Reports of Officers .....

A. VP Internal, Alex VP Brown .....

VP Brown: My reports will be very short. At 4Floors – hopefully many of you were there, it went really well, we were more efficient and less wasteful, and there were no major incidents. We already mentioned the coffee with execs from 2 to 5. Sebastian and I are planning the Winter Fair with the community, it will be taking place on Milton between Durocher and Hutchison, that will be a great opportunity for the community and students to get to know each other. If you are interested, please contact us. The website has had many great things happening – the French website is nearly ready, we are making adjustments to the calendar, you can input it yourself now, our referrals from facebook has doubled. We have been successful with facebook ads. Our hits on the website have gone up a lot. The student discount page is the third most popular page. We got a lot of thank-yous. Please come talk to me if you have any questions.



# Office of the Speaker

Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

---

Omer: At 4Floors, the top of the building had been cut off from the bottom. Is there any possibility for next year to be an ongoing process of the flow of movement?

VP Brown: The problem is that the ballroom doesn't have the largest capacity, the cafeteria has the largest capacity, and this year it was crazy, for some reason everybody in the cafeteria decided to go to the next floor at the same time. Hopefully we can try and make it more even, and we will be trying to make the signage really clear for students attending the event. There was one point where people moved en masse, but nobody got hurt. I'm happy with that.

Keresteci: Since Jason Brown has left as head of security, has nobody replaced him?

VP Brown: He was the operations person who dealt with students; Christopher Carson is his supervisor. Chris has taken over most of Jason's responsibility. We have moved into the events slow season. I will be able to see who is in Jason's place on the alcohol policy, but up to now there were no major events where we needed input

Woolf: What are the major events coming in your portfolio?

VP Brown: I can't tell you all of them, but as teasers: There may be a first year -back to school event happening at Gerts, and there may be a large concert of impressive nature in January. I don't want to jinx it, but I promise it will be good. Just don't make plans for the 21<sup>st</sup> of January.

## B. VP Clubs and Services, Sarah VP Olle.....

VP Olle: I was out for a week with the flu. I worked from home, but couldn't accomplish a lot of things. Unfortunately, that was the week of Culture Shock and the Ambassador Fee campaigns period. I heard CS went well, everything went smoothly. WE have an editor-in-chief for Old McGill, we are starting to meet and talk about the yearbook. The Tribune editors are moving along and getting incorporated within the next month. For Signage - we are starting with phase 2 of the interior signage. As for exterior signage - we received minor revisions to the sign from the Architectural Committee, and will thus have minor changes. For the 10 Year Plan for the Building - I want to have something accomplished by the end of the month, and thus am making many analyses right now. Thanks for Ivan and Jose for campaigning, I did a lot of handbilling, I'm very excited to hear the results of the ambassador fee.

Bay: Past execs have made longer plans, but the turnover makes it difficult to follow through with them. What are you doing to ensure that?

VP Olle: The great thing about construction projects is that you have to have a long-term plan, and I have no worries that projects that are started will be completed. Pauline is a permanent staff, so it will be institutionalized with her, and I will continue to give it to my successor who will carry it on.



C. VP External Affairs, Sebastian VP Ronderos-Morganerros-Morgan.....

VP Ronderos-Morgan: There is a referendum at AFELC-UQAM right now. They are doing a referendum question to affiliate, and I spent time there to advertize the affiliation. We also mounted a temporary website for TaCEQ, it is a blog right now, and I am working with our web manager to make a real website as soon as possible. We have also been working on the translation of the by-laws. As for CARE – we have made the first draft of the proposal, and we will conduct consultation with different faculties and stakeholders to guide our engagement with the community over the next few years. Contact us if you guys want to get more information. Café Conversations – I have been working on it with Charles Pitman and he is spearheading this project – we would promote it and invite people from community, students, etc to a café where we would discuss things that are important for all of us. As for Burst Your Bubble – this is a multi-day event series where students are able to sign up for events in different parts of Montreal, in coordination with SEDE office. It seems to be facing more hurdles, since I have gotten no response from the SEDE office back yet. No word on the transit survey either. As for Tuition truth – I have been working on that, and committees are going well.

D. VP University Affairs, Rebecca VP Dooleyey .....

VP Dooley: The taskforce is happening, I put up a website with information. Thanks to Dallas Bentley for helping me out. The only person who stepped up is Joel as council representative, thanks. I met with somebody from nursing, engineering and arts already, but with no other faculty. So please get your faculties to speak to me. As for the Student equity committee –we have quorum, but we are still waiting for a rep at large, one of disabilities and one of First Nation Students. It is slightly awkward to be put together because I have to specifically target those communities. As for University governance and administration – Bills 44 and 38 have been frozen! They are not going to happen! As for Senate – the research policy came. We have great concerns about the lack of transparency, and we are drafting amendments right now. I have concerns about some of the attitude of the administration towards students because of the recent events. For example, there were 12 security guards at the last senate meeting because it was rumoured that some students would come and protest, they were totally paranoid. The controversial events debate is not over, I'll be drafting something to Mendelson about what went on. Thanks for councilors Yu and Desrosiers for showing up for committee. Then, please don't abuse the self-report, you cannot report more than once. There have been lots of students reports on H1N1, and probably most of them are not authentic. Montreal has had 2,500 new cases in 2 weeks. Please take it seriously and do not fake-report.

Wun: Do you know what they are doing to control the cases in residences?



VP Dooley: It is inevitable that the flu will spread, but each student has been given hand sanitizer and instructions. There have been many cases where students have been careful and roommate has not gotten sick. It's 30 to 50 cases spread across residences. It's a pandemic, it's going to spread. McGill is good to students, they even have a new food delivery program for sick students that even creates student employment.

E. VP Finance and Operations, Jose VP Diaz .....

VP Diaz: The budget is coming later tonight. It is great that so many people showed up for budget presentation. Gerts is going well, Disband was very popular. In terms of food, the SmartChef machines are working again, and Gerts has now the 3 draftlines for more beer and cider. The menu has been redone and the new promotional material will be fully bilingual. There is no news on the Haven name front, but we are working on the inventory. Also, the manager is working on organizing book drives in December.

Abaki: In terms of the budget? Can we postpone it for 2 weeks so that members can go over it?

VP Diaz: We can discuss that later on in the discussion.

Bay: What did you discuss about residences and floor fellows?

VP Diaz: We talked about ideas to promote Gerts. We want to encourage first year students to come more, and might reach out to floor fellows to have deals for a group of students.

Hale: What is your policy on music? I enjoyed it a lot more when people used their iPods. Are you moving to having a broader musical selection?

VP Diaz: During the day, the bar tenders normally hook up their iPods, but normally there is an open policy for people to hook up their iPods if they like.

F. President, Ivan President Neilsonson.....

President Neilson: I just wanted to give a shout-out to men's rugby team. As for elections and referenda – the referendum period is now officially over, and the results are happening at Gerts right now. We will have the CEO coming up later. We got polling stations in residences, their success was varied. We also had candidate's meeting and debates, and we recently updated the online voting system, that benefits us and the faculties. As for participation –we will find out later on, but we have made a concerted effort to go out and reach quorum. As for council, we only have one more meeting this semester. Think about what we have done this semester – then we are already halfway through



the year. I attached the council goals to my report – please look at our priorities, and at what you can do to further these goals. I had my first meeting with the Presidential Affairs Committee, and we will set specific deadlines later on. I hosted a visit from some Canadian Student Association Executives and learned about other universities. Then, we are making good progress in the Green 5 Year Plan, I applied for a work-study position that has been approved, so McGill will pay half the bill for someone doing composting, recycling and other things in our building. Then, BoG retreat is happening, starting at 8am, and some topics will be McGill’s strategy for lobbying, etc. I will be going to a presentation of master plan. I stand for questions.

7. Reports of Committees .....

A. Executive Committee Report .....

President Neilson: We approved the Green Events and Green Building coordinator, the money for the ovs update, and an extended contract for the SmartChef machine. On November 11, we have hired ScarlettRounthwaite as finance committee coordinator, we approved the budgets, approved the usage of \$1,000 for website work to improve our events listings, calendar etc, and we approved \$600 from the Café Supreme student engagement event budget, approved the Old McGill Editor-in-Chief contract, and created a clubs website designer and event data input clerk position.

To: Motion to approve exec committee report.

***Motion to approve exec committee passed.***

B. Clubs and Services Report .....

Omer: We had a C&S meeting, it went really well though Miss VP Olle wasn’t there. For the Maghrebin Student’s Organization – we didn’t know yet whether there was overlap with other Muslim Students associations. The Nelson Mandela Children Fund was approved, as was the Extreme Sports Club. Then, we have the Pre-Law Society – meant for people interested who are going into law. It was also approved. The Serenasia Music Club was tabled because it was really vague about events.

Cohen: What was the difficulty in defining Maghrebin?

Omer: It’s a Muslim related culture to a group of countries, so it is regional, but we found that there were other specific regional groups. If they can show that they are not overlapping with any other Muslim groups, we will happily approve them.

Wang: Motion to approve the C&S committee report.



***Motion to approve the C&S committee report approved.***

8. Old Business.....

A. Resolution Regarding Seafood on Campus .....

VP Ronderos-Morgan: I would like to cede my time to a member of the gallery who can motivate the resolution.

Hudak: Gallery members can speak during the debate, the only thing that the mover has to do is to read out the be it resolved clauses and answer questions. You are technically the author.

VP Ronderos-Morgan: [reads the be-it-resolved clauses]

Yu: Which restaurants here in the building will be affected by the “Red List”?

VP Brown: Café Supreme, Culture’s, Tiki Ming and Liquid Nutrition – they serve salmon.

Newb: The idea of having councilors motivate is also about giving councilors responsibility to research the motion.

Pednault: Motion to ensure councilors to be able to cede their time to the gallery for a motivation speech.

***Motion to ensure councilors to be able to cede their time to the gallery for a motivation speech passed.***

O’Connor: are there any questions?

Abaki: What kind of dialogue have you had with the McGill administration?

O’Connor: We have spoken to the McGill Sustainable Foods project. The first thing we want to do is to change it at SSMU, and to talk to the different cafeterias here.

Abaki: So you haven’t consulted administration yet?

O’Connor: No.

Hudak: [explains debating rules again]

O’Connor: I will motivate the motion now. Our motion is to get red-listed fish off campus. This includes fish that are commonly sourced from overfished and depleted stocks, or are being fished by



## Office of the Speaker

Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

---

non-sustainable measures which leads to the stock being rapidly depleted. According to the SSMU constitution, we should be “demonstrating leadership in matters of human rights, social justice and environmental protection. The Society shall be mindful of the direct and indirect effects corporations, businesses and organizations have on their social, political, economic, and environmental surroundings”. This motion would fulfill this part of constitution. Overfishing is a serious issue, and any difference that the student body here can make would be great. We would not just be banning fish, we would just be giving better food choices to students.

Pednault: Are there any similar policies in other universities?

O’Connor: Nothing specific to this, so it would be a great initiative for McGill. There are many cafeterias who have tried to follow the ocean-wise guidelines, but this policy would be preventative in nature.

Wang: Have you examined the current cafeteria on campus, estimate on how much of their current fish is redlisted?

O’Connor: Yes, the research was done last spring. We talked to managers, and have a complete list. In the SSMU building it is mainly tuna and salmon, so it is not necessarily such a big issue, but it is more a preventative measure. If there are any added fish products put on menus, should follow these guidelines.

Keresteci: Some things are on the red list or not. How is farmed not sustainable?

O’Connor: There are many very unsustainable practices, e.g. there are many chemicals used during that process that leak into the ocean, and there are a lot of diseases that end up accumulating in those areas, and some fish that escape bring those out. That is a good point, a lot of the fish on the avoid list are in the good list too, it is more about the method.

Abaki: It’s a good motion with a good intent, but I do not agree with the intent. To consult with the administration, the cafeteria, etc. would be a more responsible way of tackling this issue.

VP Ronderos-Morgan: I would like to suggest an amendment. I would like to have the motivators’ go-ahead though. I would like to change the wording in the second be it resolved-clause from “insist upon” to “encourage”. The relations that we have to our tenants are important, and encouraging is a more mild way of advocating for this practice.

Gallery: The purpose of SSMU is to help the students of McGill, so by going to the student society first, we have the backing from the student body to then go to the administration. It is important to get the backing from the student body. It is about human rights as well as environmental, since much fishing is done in developing areas. Bottom trawling takes up the entire bottom ecosystem of the ocean. As for





# Office of the Speaker

Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

farm-raising – they keep salmon in the Atlantic Ocean in giant nets, and 3 million annually escape with diseases, so diseases flourish. I think it is really important that we do pass this motion, so that when we go talk to the administration, we will have their backing.

Omer: I would like to move to previous question.

**Motion to move to previous question passed.**

**Resolution Regarding Seafood on Campus passed.**

President Neilson: I would like to amend the agenda. I would like to include a guest speaker right now, to include the guest speaker.

Motion passed.

Guest speaker

Vallo: I’m the CEO of McGill. The results from the elections are as followed: For the FYC – VP Academic is Simon Liu with 79.8%; VP Finance, Benjamin Comeau with 80.6%, VP Communications: Sophia Su with 49%, VP Internal: Valerie Mathis with 50.4%, VP External: Sarah Lazure with 35.5%, President: Larah Maunder with 56.8%. We had a 25.5% turnout for Fall referendum, as for the plebiscites: the question about course packs – yes 52.7%, 42% no. About exam schedule – 25.6% yes, 70.2% no, The Ambassador Fee passed with 51.6% yes, 42% no, and MILC Fee Renewal passed with 74.6% yes, 19.2% no. The Sustainable Fee passed 78.9%, 19.4% no.

VP Brown: How could one compare results?

Vallo: Only in 2006 we had a higher turnout in the last years, last year didn’t have quorum, you did fairly well.

9. New Business .....

A. Budget Revision Presentation .....

VP Diaz: Can I move the budget presentation to the end of new business?

**Motion to amend the agenda passed. (17 in favor)**

B. Resolution Regarding the Revocation of Choose Life’s Club Status .....

Pednault: [reads be-it-resolved clause]. I cede to friendly speaker.

VP Olle: Motion to extend speaking time to 20 minutes.



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

***Motion to extend speaking time to 20 minutes failed.***

VP Olle: Motion to extend speaking time to 15 minutes.

***Motion to extend speaking time to 15 minutes failed.***

VP Ronderos-Morgan: Motion to move into committee of the whole.

VP Brown: Is there a reason why you voted no? There is a motivator who has written something in advance who will need this time, it would be respectful.

Keresteci: I would like all points to be concise.

VP Diaz: Seen as we are in committee of the whole, couldn't one person talk as long as they want.

Omer: Please consider your decision – since the motion about of freedom of speech.

VP Olle: The job of the speakers is to disallow redundant comments, we should leave that to them.

Dobson: Since so many people have put a lot of effort into writing this motion, I don't think that depriving gallery members of time should be allowed. People from the public should be allowed to make their voice heard.

Kaufman: We can split it up into 4 sections, that is what we were hoping to do, but we have to go through a lot of information. I would appreciate this.

Marshall: Motion to move out of committee of the whole.

Motion passed.

VP Brown: Motion to extend speaking time to 16 minutes.

***Motion to extend speaking time to 16 minutes passed.***

Kaufman: I would like to begin by telling you that this is not an issue of free speech. What we are dealing with is an issue of health and safety. This motion is not trying to stifle opinions. We are responding to a series of harmful actions after having consulted with SSMU's equity policy. This is not about the larger politics of abortion or the concept of free speech. Abortion, as dealt with by the law, is an issue of health and safety, not of politics. That's why it's legal and why doctors and legitimate health organizations distribute accurate health information. For safety. Choose Life has become an issue of health and safety at McGill. This club has acted in dangerous, harmful, harassing ways ever



## Office of the Speaker

Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

---

since it has been a SSMU club. We will tell you exactly what they have done and why it is harmful to students at this school. We will also tell you how what they have done directly threatens the good work done by McGill Health Services. Full club status was granted to Choose Life because they said they would not show graphic imagery. They also said that they would refrain from the guilt and shock tactics I used by other campus anti-abortion clubs sponsored by the National Campus Life Network. At the SSMU council meeting of Oct 28, 2008, the club was granted interim status. At this meeting, members of the gallery said that Choose Life might act in ways that make them feel unsafe, using the tactics of shock, shame, threat and graphic imagery. This is what other NCLN campus groups had done. Natalie Fohl, president of Choose Life stood up and said that Choose Life had decided against graphic images. In addition, a member of Choose Life vowed that the club would take a gentler approach. People in the gallery were appeased by these statements and by the fact that no SSMU councilors would condone the use of graphic abortion imagery. Devin Alfaro and other councilors affirmed that Choose Life would be carefully watched and that their status would be revoked if they threatened student safety or contravened SSMU's policies. We ask now that you keep the promises this council made to students in regards to protecting their safety and sticking to its equity policy. Student Health Services works extremely hard to provide students with facts and to deconstruct harmful myths, so that students can make informed decisions about their health. How, then, does Choose Life benefit McGill students? Choose Life says they benefit students by "Compiling and making information on pregnancy options and post-abortion help available online and at club events". Unfortunately, the help Choose Life offers consists of referring pregnant women to anti-abortion centres. These anti-abortion present themselves present themselves as medical clinics, but really exist only to stop women from having abortions. These institutions provide lab quality pregnancy and ultrasound tests as well as free pre-natal vitamins to pregnant women. These three things are typically what a woman needs to get through the first trimester of her pregnancy. This amounts to a delay tactic since a woman dealing with a "Crisis Pregnancy Centre" would not need or be encouraged to see a doctor until late in her pregnancy, at which point an abortion would be more complicated. Crisis Pregnancy Centers also have a history of using shock tactics in the form of graphic and disturbing images and misinformation to scare women away from abortion. Real medical clinics already provide information on all pregnancy options. McGill counseling and health services doctors will provide unbiased and non-judgmental support. In contrast, the post-abortion "support" recommended by Choose Life encourages women to personify and mourn their lost fetuses and to view themselves as having committed murder, so that they can get forgiveness from God for the sin of abortion. - Choose Life has held the following events which contravene their promises to SSMU as well as SSMU's equity policy: The display at the crossroads showed drawings of fetuses speaking about their mothers in first person. What they are doing is targeting pregnant women by showing images of fetuses who are begging not to be aborted. As well, these images target post-abortive women by forcing them to view images that are intended to make them feel guilt and shame. After



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

this event. Equity complaints were submitted to SSMU. This event was at the cross roads, meaning that students could not avoid it. To quote Morton Mendelson: "On campus there may [...] be limits imposed on the placement of disturbing images meant to support positions or on handouts to people who have not willingly agreed to accept such materials." Morton Mendelson himself agrees that there should be limits on the circulation of disturbing images meant to support positions. As for The Silent no more awareness campaign: SSMU equity policy promotes discussion as long as it is conducted in a "respectful and non-coercive manner". SSMU equity policy also states: "All members of the society will reflect: Respect for safety". As part of the silent no more awareness campaign, Choose Life handed out flyers in the Shatner lobby. This included pamphlets stating that abortion causes breast, cervical and ovarian cancer which is entirely untrue, according to health Canada and all reputable medical sources. Intentionally lying to students about their health in order to further a political agenda is dangerous. Their pamphlets also listed an 11% complication rate for abortion, whereas the actual rate in Canada is between 0.2 and 1.7%. The statistic was false and the footnote is intentionally fabricated.. This violates the equity policy because it threatens women's safety by encouraging them to make health decisions based on wrong information. Can SSMU support a club that circulates dangerous and false medical information,? During the same event, CL members held signs at the Y-intersection, which read "Women do regret abortions". One of the speakers at the event said: "When women tell me that they do not personally regret their abortion I tell them, Not Yet!". This diverges significantly from Choose Life's stated goals of reaching out to people with post-abortion help. These actions imply that women who choose abortion should live with regret forever. The event was not a place to share experiences but a campaign using picketing tactics that students could not avoid since they were in high-traffic areas. Can SSMU support a campaign that targets women? As for the Echoes of the Holocaust event: SSMU's equity policy states: "The SSMU [...] shall promote an anti-oppressive environment that fosters a culture of respect." On October 6th, the club hosted an event in which a comparison was drawn between abortion and several historical genocides. Posters were put up for this event. Choose Life protested that the event did not seek to compare women to Nazis, but rather to compare the dehumanization of genocide victims to the dehumanization of fetuses. But, the advertising on posters and facebook did not explain this nuance so people who saw the poster would compare doctors and post-abortive women to the perpetrators of genocide. By hosting this event, CL went back on their promise not to display graphic imagery. Furthermore CL's warning about the graphic imagery that would be shown was misleading. People who chose to go to the event were told that they would see images of the "results" of abortion. They were not warned that they would be shown a close up video of the extraction of fetal remains from a vagina. People attending this event were in no way prepared to see the kind of explicit images that José Ruba insisted on showing. According to the CCB, the images are intended to be UNFORGETTABLE. It is abusive to show



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

students disturbing images which may impact their mental well-being for the rest of their lives, especially without warning. Will this council stand for the continued existence of a club that emotionally targets pregnant and post-abortive women, spreads false information about the possible medical repercussions of abortion, violates SSMU's equity policy in numerous ways, and has misled the student body at every turn? Images of bloodied female reproductive organs including vaginas and uteruses, coupled with dangerous health information, threatening messages and emotionally abusive comparisons make women feel harassed. This is not a matter of speculation. People have told you. They have filed equity complaints. They have spoken up at your meetings and they have written about it. I am telling you that now. Harassment, particularly the kind that uses images of sex organs is not to be tolerated by this council according to your own documents. While it is not your place to decide what is and is not harassment under the law, it is your place to err on the side of caution, protecting the students and other people who walk around McGill from harm. You must ask yourself if SSMU will willingly allow acts of harassment at McGill. The first paragraph of SSMU's equity policy states that it will uphold The McGill Charter of Student's Rights as well as The Quebec Charter of Human Rights. You are bound to all three of these documents and must uphold their policies on harassment. This may not remain an internal issue. Because it involves matters of health, safety, and harassment, it is a matter that concerns the fundamental rights of individuals. A person who is harassed and is made to feel targeted and unsafe at a SSMU event could file complaints with The Quebec Human Rights Tribunal or take legal action against SSMU. Abortion was ultimately de-criminalized in Canada because a supreme court said that in light of the many, many, many deaths and illness that occur as a direct result of illegal or self induced abortions, for the government to prevent in any way a woman from accessing a safe abortion violates her constitutional right to safety of person. In this way it is considered by the law an issue of public health and safety, rather than an issue of personal comfort, or even human rights. Are you prepared now for SSMU to support an organization that stands in open defiance of a ruling that protects a woman's right to safety of person? The SSMU condemns harassment or discrimination on the basis of, among other things, gender and sexual orientation. I would like now to read out the language that Choose Life used to support its anti-choice platform: "Abortion compromises who we are as women. Women are designed to give life and nurture it. When we abort our children, we interfere with the natural process of procreation and it leaves and imprint on our heart that never goes away, but is often denied." This language is misogynist because lots of woman do not want babies and will not have babies and these people are still real women. They are not unnatural. These pamphlets assume that the only coupling that is natural is a coupling that makes babies. It assumes that all women should have children regardless of their own desires. The equity policy promotes an anti-oppressive environment and applies to homophobia and misogyny. If SSMU's equity policy is sincere, then SSMU has no choice but to take action against groups which violate it so



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

explicitly. You must now ask yourself whether SSMU is going to condone a club that circulates materials that contradict SSMU's equity policy. It is time for Choose life's existence as a SSMU club to end. Suspending choose life's club status is inadequate because it assumes that they, in essence, are a club that belongs at McGill. The initial debate over granting choose life temporary club status and the subsequent debate over full club status ultimately ended in this body deciding that denying choose life club status would be a violation of SSMU's constitution and mandate. But, as we've shown through our descriptions of the events choose life has put on, through the way they have misrepresented themselves and through the harm they have inflicted on the physical and mental health of students, the choose life that was proposed and defended to SSMU during last year's debates has never existed. Choose life initially proposed a club that would not use graphic abortive imagery. They proposed a club that would provide a needed service to students, and they proposed a club that would not hurt students. Choose Life said whatever necessary in order to gain club status. A motion to suspend places choose life in the same position they were in last year, that is, a position where all they have to do regain SSMU's support and their club status is re-propose the fictitious choose life of last year's debates. Because Choose Life has consistently acted in violation of their word, created an environment where respectful debate is impossible, and because SSMU council now has an opportunity to put an end to this harmful club, you as councilors become accountable for choose life's future actions which, as we have every reason to believe, are going to be very similar to their past actions. The motion to revoke is this council's opportunity to take control in preventing Choose Life from harming students. This is urgent and must be dealt with now because Choose Life has shown that as a SSMU club, they are not accountable to this council's wishes, as evidenced by their violation of the censure of their Echoes of the Holocaust event and their insistence on holding a member's only event in the SSMU building, which also included graphic abortion imagery. Any action taken against choose life short of revoking their club status is an endorsement of a club which, in its actions and through its connections to national organizations, demonizes women and restricts their right to bodily safety and sovereignty. If this council disagrees with Choose Life, but feels obligated to permit their existence, you have to be comfortable with using the concept of free speech to justify discrimination, harassment, and coercion. You also have to be comfortable with SSMU's name acting to legitimize a club that threatens students' safety by encouraging them to make decisions based on inaccurate health information. Front and center on their pamphlets are the words "Choose Life, Student Society of McGill University." As long as Choose Life is a club, they will proudly display the fact that they enjoy the support of our student society. As members of that student society, we will not stand for this abuse. Do not mistake our arguments for an attempt to shut down discussion solely because we ideologically disagree with our opponents. Ideology takes a back seat to bodily sovereignty, health, and safety. And do not underestimate the abuse women on our campus have suffered because of Choose Life's presence. Because Choose Life has proven to us through their actions that they have no



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

place at McGill, we beg that this council adhere to its equity policy and protect our rights and the rights of others on campus by revoking Choose Life's club status. I stand for questions.

To: If the information in the pamphlet is false – where did you get your statistics? How are they verifiable?

Kaufman: Don't have the statistics in paper, but if you phone Health Canada as we did, they told us there was no link between breast cancer and abortion, you can look at statistics Canada or Health Canada for range of complication.

Fohl: I want to respond to the points that were brought up. As for the medical information – we have no interest in distributing false information. Nobody brought to our club the information that the information was false, if it is problematic, we would truly like that to be brought up. I looked into the abortion-breast cancer link, and if you ask some members of scientific community, they say yes. There exist deeply conflicting studies, and research methods vary, so the issue is not settled. Obviously, we want to provide accurate information, I'm sorry if those are false. Clearly, we have the health and safety of women and children in our minds. As for the Echoes of Holocaust –the only promotion we did was to create the facebook event that explained the title, there were no posters, I did not put those up, so I don't know what you saw. I also sent an e-mail out to our listserve in which I explained the linkage made. Regarding the equity policy, we completely respect them. Obviously, some students have different ideas, but we agree that everyone should be respected. Choose life's mandate is to provide respect of all persons, including those currently discriminated against because of their age. As I mentioned, respect is not only due to the unborn, but to everyone on our campus. I cede to questions on the floor.

VP Olle: In a personal conversation, I had asked you whether you understood why this body censored the Echoes. Could you reiterate your points?

Fohl: We decided to carry on the event. Our group seeks the wellbeing of all persons, no matter which age. Our efforts for the event did fall in our mandate. All advertisement made sure to explain the parallels being drawn by the speaker.

Calger: In the event that this motion does not pass, what steps will Choose Life take to make sure that the issues do not reoccur?

Fohl: Choose Life is very open to student input at large. The reaction of the student body is something that we respect. As individual, I cannot make promises for the group in the future, though.

Gallery: What information does Choose life provide?



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

Fohl: The services we refer to are not clinics for abortion, but clinics for people who intend to carry on with their pregnancy. We have a link for Silence no more Awareness campaign, and one to the Centre for Reproductive Loss. This is a section of our mandate that we are seeking to expand.

Gallery: When I was at the Echoes of the Holocaust event, I felt personally violated by the pictures of a bloody vagina the speaker showed. I feel this bordered on harassment. What would you respond to that?

Fohl: We do welcome feedback. We did try to make clear what would be shown at the event. I apologize if that was not clear enough.

Bay: In your opinion, are your club's goals contrary to the health and safety of students?

Fohl: I see our mandate contributing to the wellbeing of all people and students. We view our mandate as promoting wellbeing, and we would like to open discussion and include different views.

Marshall: In response to Representative Calver's response, you personally did say that you wouldn't be using graphic imagery. This is a promise you did not hold.

Fohl: I apologize if the comment was taken as a long-term commitment. I did not see it as a promise.

Woolf: Most events you have had have hosted speakers from off-campus lobby groups. Why did you pick our campus as a lobby-ground?

Fohl: We brought the speakers because we think that the events have legitimate viewpoint, and would be interesting to be discussed. We feel they provide a perspective on our campus that hasn't been extensively shared.

Hale: Why would you invite a group on campus with an event at the crossroads that is open to the public?

Fohl: The group exists to provide a perspective that was lacking before. The goal for the event was to allow the "Silent No More" speeches to happen and to reach out to other people who have experienced abortions.

Yu: Acknowledging that the use of graphic images is one of the main reasons why this body has censored the event, and knowing that what happened, might happen again, would you like to offer some consequences if your club does these things again?





Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

Fohl: I don't operate under the assumption that our club shouldn't use graphic imagery. In terms of consequences, our club already doesn't have funding from the SSMU.

VP Olle: Motion to extend speaker time by 10 minutes.

***Motion to extend speaker time by 10 minutes.***

Briones: How would you strengthen your personal accountability as president of club, how would you improve the transparency of actions and strengthen your accountability as president?

Fohl: Our club does seek to be transparent, maybe we could advertize our events ahead of time or make even clearer what they will be about.

Dobson: Regarding the literature, what organization was responsible for the distribution of pamphlets?

Fohl: The "Silence No More Awareness" campaign was the author, but since Choose Life invited them, we might be responsible for them. We had pamphlets available in lobby, but no one actually handed them out.

VP Dooley: Seeing as a lot of what Choose Life has become is about Free speech, and not abortion, why do you want to be on the SSMU, how does being a SSMU club help your mandate?

Fohl: Privilege to book spaces on campus is a major convenience, and it is also about booking spaces on campus at large, not only in this building. We believe that this club falls into SSMU's mandate, there is no reason we shouldn't.

Mehta: Have you the power to change your mandate to incorporate possible suggestions?

Fohl: We have that power, but I don't think that we should do that. But that could be something that the SSMU could ask us to do.

VP Ronderos-Morgan: Where has Choose Life been receiving funding?

Fohl: Last year, we wrote many community organizations asking for funding, and we received 4 donations between \$100 and \$200 from churches. Zero organizations have been covering our costs, our bank account is empty. The "Silent no more Awareness" organizers and Jose Ruba both did events with Campaign Quebec Vie, so we have split their travel and accommodation costs.

Davis: What would be the next event you are planning?



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

Fohl: We plan to institute a book club, and we hope to have regular discussion meetings on different bioethical issues. I don't have an exact idea on our next event, but it might be a fundraiser to support pregnant women on campus. Richard Burnier is a doctoral student in the religious faculty who would be head of the book club.

Kaufman: You argued that no other club has such restrictions – but do you know of any other club that has resulted in students saying that they have been harmed?

Fohl: I think we are working within SSMU's policies, I don't think that we are special in that respect.

Debate:

Pedneault: How many equity complaints have been received?

Omer: As for the first speaker – saying that it is not an internal issue, and making threats to file legal complaints are inappropriate and offensive in a motivation speech.

VP Dooley: I take personal offense against that point – it is true that there has been legal action taken against other student organizations. It shouldn't have been conceived as a threat.

VP Brown: I motion to limit speaking time per speaker to 5 minutes.

***Motion to limit speaking time per speaker to 5 minutes passed.***

Dobson: This is my first SSMU meeting, and it is very interesting. As student with active interest in sexual health, I feel that organizations must be held accountable for the information they disseminate. There is the possibility to spread propaganda or outright lies –we have the invariable expectation that information be truthful. Choose Life cannot find shelter under the fact that external association was responsible for distributing untrue information, they should assume responsibility for their mistakes. It is irresponsible that Choose Life didn't fact-check the pamphlets. I always hope that campus will be a place of serious academic discussion –their willingness to abuse the system for their own ends insults me. SSMU would send a message that it is ok to lie to students, and not have responsibility if information was distributed if we let it be. Only by enforcing ideals can a constructive discourse develop. Pro-Life clubs should have free reign to discuss what they want, but not to disseminate false information– we should discipline specific groups that chose to violate policies, I don't think that debate has anything to do with free expression or abortion, it's what SSMU can do for upholding its own expectations.

Hudak: People sitting by the door, please make a clear path for the door.



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

To: It seems to me that the main argument of the pro-side is that events have been disdainful and distasteful. However, there is no jurisdiction in the world for the right to not be offended. The fact that an event is provocative or offensive to some people, does not mean that we have to ban it. We have responsibility for not only the majority, but also the minority. I received e-mails of constituents, and I would like to cite one: "Those who are against abortion may be in a minority, but their opinion is thus not rendered invalid". I yield to the floor.

VP Brown: Motion to skip caucus period.

### ***Motion to skip caucus period***

VP Ronderos-Morgan: I wanted to bring up that the specific organization that Fohl mentioned, the co-sponsor Campagne Quebec Vie, has on its front page of its website the statement that "abortion is slavery". I think we should take that into account. This is the organization that is funding a speaker under SSMU. There is also a link to the youtube video taken of the protest, and there are very offensive and threatening things written about the protesters, among others threatening their lives. This is the organization funding the speech on campus under our auspices.

Bay: To address Sebastian's point – I don't think that guilt by association is valid, this was not our Choose Life Club. This is not a debate about free speech, but the resolution provides no ground for revoking a club status. The clause nr. 7 in the resolution is not a fact, as proven by Natalie. The equity policy actually protects this club. [reads policy] By revoking club, we are repressing the club. The equity policy is not concrete, it provides no grounds for revocation. It gives examples of repercussions as letters of apology, suspension of club status and cancellation of financial support. Financial support was suspended in the past. We have done that. Now to go ahead and revoke them on no grounds would be against our purview. The allegations that they were providing untrue information are unverifiable, lots of clubs provide statistics that are opinionated, all political clubs do that. We are on no grounds to revoke the club, we already made the decision to punish them.

Briones: How do you justify that breaking specific clauses of our student equity policy is not grounds for protecting students?

Bay: Directly following these clauses say that we shouldn't discriminate against any students.

Marshall: I would welcome if you could finish your quote of the equity policy.

Bay: It says we shouldn't discriminate against students or clubs "provided that they represent their opinion in a respectful and non-coercive manner"



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

VP Ronderos-Morgan: And I would like to refute the claim that I was making them guilty by association.

Bay: You did say that it alludes to something. You were trying to make association from one organization to another.

Andrea: I am troubled by your definition of oppression. If you don't define that term, none of what you say is validated.

Bay: I would define oppression as "Not allowing people to express their opinion".

Dobson: How can you justify maintaining club status if they have violated our guidelines in that they followed through with a SSMU council – censored event?

Bay: We have already given them their punishment for censored event. The ban on graphic imagery is not in our equity policy, That was only a personal agreement.

Andrea: Is the Equity commissioner here? Can he define oppression?

VP Brown: Motion to move into committee of the whole.

### ***Motion to move into committee of the whole passed.***

Kaufman: I'm baffled by the comment of Representative To, I thought it was clear that we referred to concrete things in the Equity policy that were violated. The point of the e-mail seems to be unfounded, since all points in our motivation hinged on their actions and not their viewpoint. As to the point about free speech in the equity policy, we talked about what is violated, it was covered in motivation. If Health Canada and any reputable source affirmed that pamphlet contained lies, I think we can assume that. Could you tell me, Representative Bay, of another club on campus that has circulated untrue, harmful information with the goal of manipulating them?

Bay: You would see subjects like global warming where people give different facts, and these facts change the point of view. Another example is the reason of the Lebanon bombing of Israel. There were civilians killed – but others said they were being used as body shields. Even if it is true that you said that they distributed untrue information, there is no concrete statement that says they knew about it.

VP Brown: Point of personal privilege.



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

Marshall: If a political party is deemed illegal on terms of its conduct, it isn't saying that opposition of the government is illegal. We are not deciding that this aspect and viewpoint is illegal, none of us want to limit free speech or debate, but the practices that this group uses. If in the future there is a opposition group that really wants to debate the issue, we should reconsider this topic.

Abaki: We need to appreciate and take at heart that McGill is a diverse place. We will not agree on abortion tonight. Choose Life did things that people did not agree with. We need to recognize that people feel differently. To say that Choose life's status should be revoked and that they don't belong at McGill, it is saying that they do not belong here. They should be given the possibility of making a mistake. We come from different societies that believe different things. I come from Kenya, others come from Canada, and there are some practices in my country that others might find offensive. We should respect that McGill is a diverse community. I don't think that the way this debate is going is constructive. McGill and SSMU should focus on events that bring students together. We must acknowledge the fact that people have different opinions, and defend the right of everyone to voice their opinion.

Ma: Let's take a step back. We should represent all opinions. We have the responsibility to reflect the belief of all students. We have to reconsider that in SSMU, we are here to reconsider that our clubs should be here to do what they should do. They are here to express their beliefs. I have to agree that their method of expressing beliefs is not acceptable, but maybe we should reconsider the fact of revoking their club, but consider other possibilities of censoring them.

VP Brown: Motion to move out of committee of the whole.

***Motion to move out of committee of the whole passed.***

Hale: I will no longer be writing Choose Life articles for the Daily, since it has become obvious that I have an opinion on this. I find it problematic that councilors comment on events that they didn't attend. I recognize the right to represent opinions, but they have distributed wrong opinions, they have shamed women, particularly Jose Ruba – his argumentation hasn't been well structured at all. He has not attempted to explore the issue academically. What does the club offer that SACOMSS and health services didn't have? Also, CFS said that Pro Life clubs shouldn't be on campus.

Keresteci: Do you agree with the viewpoint of CFS?

Hale: I'm not opposed to the idea in general, but there is no academic discussion going on here. I don't necessarily agree with CFS.



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

Imi: How do you suggest that pro-lifers should express themselves? How do you suggest that Choose Life keeps their ideals as long as they are truthful?

Hale: I don't think that you are truthful. If you are revoked, maybe you could go to back the drawing board and reconsider inviting speakers that make the discussion academic and truthful.

Bay: If CFS said that pro-Choice organizations didn't belong on campus, would you also support that viewpoint?

Hale: Maybe that point goes to you.

Dobson: Do you feel that images of graphic images as tool helped the student body at McGill?

Hale: I saw it more as a shock tactic, especially since they were often given without information explaining them.

Hudak: I allow the speaker, although he is not a member of the undergraduate society, to speak as long as he brings new points to the floor.

VP Dooley: Motion to appeal the decision of the chair.

### ***Motion to appeal the decision of the chair failed.***

Gallery: I'm an active member of Choose Life. I found Mr. Ruba's approach to be disagreeable, unproductive and not good for Choose Life. It had little or no merit, and I found the use of inflammatory language personally disruptive. Everyone as member of Choose life had major concerns with the speech, but we felt that there were issues that needed to be seen on campus. Every decision has been made with the desire to be rational, and to bring discussion on campus. Sitting in the lecture hall, I had the opportunity to listen to members of the audience who opposed Choose Life, and I learned things that I would have not otherwise seen. We want to think about how events make people feel. I would not use graphic images; I find them unpleasant, and I recognize that there are sensitivities that I cannot fully access as a man. I recognize that the use of images is offensive. We can oppose the fabrication of images. We have no interest in distributing falsehoods. We can promise not to mislead people, and not to show public imagery, those are things we can promise to council. We cannot promise once and for all not to say or depict something that is reality, since we want to defend the rights of the unborn child also. The discussion can be civic, and having Choose Life as a club means being a productive member of the campus society.



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

Pedneault: What happened within Choose Life when Council censored the event and you considered cancelling?

Gallery: We met and discussed, but felt that we should give Ruba the possibility to express his opinion, my intention was to address questions at the end and to question his argumentation. .

Keresteci: Motion to extend question period for 5 minutes.

***Motion to extend question period for 5 minutes passed.***

Gallery: One of the reasons we were hesitating to cancel was that cancellation would be perceived as a pure mercenary gesture, it concerned just the funding issue, so we did not want to give that image. But we invited him with a great deal of objections about the title and things he said in the discussion.

Omer: You said that you were against certain things. Would you be willing to put choose life on the line to make us trust your club again?

Gallery: Based on our conversation as a group, we have no problem to make a promise that we wouldn't show images publicly without fair warning and to guarantee that we insist on using true information.

Mais: How is that promise now different from our decision last year? We already had this situation before.

Gallery: Last year it was connected to a specific event, it was not a promise, it was an earnest statement of an inclination, of a preference. If our club status is on the line, we can concede as much as we can on principle. We understand that people don't want to be confronted with images without fair warning, we can agree to that. We will not accept fabrications.

Potterson: How about at the crossroads –that is in a very public area.

Abaki: Motion to move to previous question.

***Motion to move to previous question rejected after straw poll.***

Woolf: We have heard a lot of apologetics, a lot of "We didn't mean to" – we haven't heard any accountability. They said they were not responsible for the speaker that they have brought in that has caused this uproar within our community. Club has confessed not to stand behind the events, but they have gone ahead with their events. We require that they be accountable to SSMU. This club doesn't have responsibility for their information, They are a loose cannon. This is about their actions, and



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

what they have done is wrong, we have already acknowledged that, in that we have censured an event, but we haven't delved into the issue further.

Mehta: Do you feel that revocation is the first step we can use to hold them accountable?

Woolf: Absolutely. My point is that we need to do something. My main concern is to do something.

Farrell: Hasn't there already been action to punish them?

Woolf: What we have found is that finances aren't enough to stop the root of the problem. A lot of clubs have external organizations that support them. SSMU's censure of event hasn't been taken seriously, which shows that we need to go further.

Bay: On what grounds do you suggest the revocation?

Woolf: All of the grounds suggested throughout this meeting are grounds for revocation, or a serious assessment to be made. I reject the assumption that we shouldn't be doing anything. That is ridiculous.

Dobson: Does openly violating an oral agreement with SSMU or disseminating false information constitute grounds for revocation?

VP Olle: In our bylaws, there are no specified reasons to revoke a club's status.

Yu: I believe one of the main points we are discussing is the usage of false information as vehicle to carry their messages. Suggesting that our body should say that there is no false information is dangerous, but we don't want to say what is correct. This is what Prof Mendelson was talking about at the town hall. I am firmly believing what Health Canada is saying, but what this debate is about is whether me or any body should decide what is right, and I trust that our students can do that. I on behalf of EUS am opposed to the revocation. I think that it should be a compromise, best a compromise in writing.

Kaufman: Why shouldn't the previous verbal agreements not be binding?

Yu: It would be in response to the censure that we have given and consequences we have given Choose Life, we should hold this written agreement legally binding as well.

Wun: You said that students have the right to believe Health life or info from Choose Life. If what Choose Life is presenting is offensive, harmful to students, what do you have to say about that?





Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

Yu: I'm sure that the Pope would have thought it very offensive to say that the earth is not the centre of the universe. That is not the environment we should bring ourselves in.

Pedneault: Motion to have leave to show a powerpoint presentation of the leaflets.

***Motion to have leave to show a powerpoint presentation of the leaflets passed.***

Pedneault: To get the facts clear, this is the leaflet. The document cited by the pamphlet contradicts facts that the pamphlet was stating.

Fabian: Motion to move back into council.

***Motion to move back into council passed.***

Gallery: I co-authored the resolution. It was not meant to be a threat, but just to remind the council that you are accountable to Quebec law and human rights. If women don't see themselves protected, they might move to other bodies. Natalie said that she wouldn't put limits on their events, and there is nothing that you could do to make it safe in the future, that was seen in the last events. We do not say that individual members would not belong at McGill, neither would the pro life opinion or hypothetical club not belong to McGill, but only this club from the history that they have done.

Bay: Would you be in favor of other measures?

Gallery: No, it would imply that they have demonstrated ability to be accountable to this organization in the past, and that was not the case. I feel that because they demonstrated that they lie and cannot be held accountable, I am suspicious and could not trust in anything that they did after this probational period was over.

Abaki: I beg to differ with you, how can they express their views other than in their club?

Gallery: They are affiliated with the larger Choose Life community, and it has been shown that the view that abortion is wrong could be demonstrated in other, more productive ways.

Omer: I move to previous question by secret ballot.

***Motion to previous question by secret ballot approved.***

VP Olle: Motion to vote by secret ballot.

***Motion to vote by secret ballot passed.***



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

# Office of the Speaker

---

Gallery: How do gallery members know whether their representatives followed their mandate?

Hudak: You ask them.

**Resolution Regarding the Revocation of Choose Life's Club Status failed with 11 in favor and 14 in negation.**

C. Resolution Regarding Choose Life's Club Status .....

Woolf: [reads the be-it-resolved clauses]

VP Dooley: Currently, I am sitting in the Equity Committee, then there is Jonathan Hahn, Councilor Woolf, Hanna Augustin, and Halin Toore. We do not have a representative on First Nations and one on Students with Disabilities.

Woolf: Whatever equity committee recommends would have to be approved by council.

Keresteci: How would this measure work?

Woolf: The Equity Committee would take due measure to consider this issue seriously, and it would be in collaboration with Choose Life.

VP Olle: You can also overturn a decision, again by council.

Woolf: You can defer a policy to a committee like any other matter.

VP Dooley: Is it not the mandate of the Equity committee to deal with current equity issues and violations of the Equity policy?

Woolf: Yes.

Omer: Do I have leave to raise a point?

**Leave granted.**

Omer: I feel that since a suspension of club is unchartered territory, we should err on the side of caution and have a 2/3 majority to decide on this issue. I motion to have a 2/3 majority vote.

**Motion to have a 2/3 majority vote passed by simple majority.**



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

Woolf: I would like to clarify – we have talked to Councilor Omer about this too– in this kind of decision, we want to be certain to be judicially sound in our decisions, and we don't think that any of you should have any reservations to vote in favor of this motion. Motion to exit leave.

***Motion to exit leave passed.***

VP Ronderos-Morgan: Motion to extend speaking time for 10 minutes.

***Motion to extend speaking time for 10 minutes passed.***

VP Ronderos-Morgan: In light of the fact that we already heard a motivation speech on issue, I took out the redundant issues. We appreciate the points made by previous movers, and the reasons for taking Choose Life's actions seriously are valid. There has been so much dialogue around it that council is compelled to take some kind of action. I would like to aim to bring the SSMU perspective to guide us. There were 2 council meetings since Echoes of Holocaust. We have had extensive consultation, and we want to make it clear that it was not solely the Echoes of Holocaust event that brought us to move this motion. We have seen repeatedly that Choose Life cannot hold the trust of SSMU council. Some people expressed concern that Choose Life was treated differently than other clubs. But it has pushed boundaries, and SSMU needed to address that manner. They have acted in bad faith with council, and are part of national organization with conflictive relations on campus in the past. They promised not to use graphic images but still did so. Is it necessary that they do their messaging under the SSMU umbrella? History of untrustworthiness is association with the organization – the National Campus Life Network. They have a website, and it seems all good at first, but the problems are that examples of key activities include guest speakers, and the first suggested speaker is Jose Ruba. They also suggest the Genocide awareness project. We cannot have that on our own campus. Choose Life has never given the promise that they wouldn't do that. That is a big problem. Associated clubs have had extensive track record in other universities, they put up posters in women's bathrooms, and in a case the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the student union for not renewing club status. This is well documented, at the universities of Guelph and York for example, and they have all had associated clubs. Fundamentally we have to recognize that they are encouraged to bring Holocaust and Genocide Awareness Project on campus. I will take their word that they won't bring it on campus at the present, but the club will still be a doorway for the NCLN. We should not be lazy and pass on that responsibility for future events. What would be sufficient disciplinary action? The censure was designed as deterrent, but it seems that freezing their access to money has been an insufficient deterrent, as it seems highly unlikely that choose life are paying for the air fare and the honorarium of speakers. No club has ever had as many equity complaints. Has choose life been on the side of moderation? We need to take action. This resolution does.



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

Keresteci: I believe that this motion is the exact same motion that we just voted on, only that we are referring it to another body. I feel that the equity committee is an inferior body to this council. We should decide as this body whether they should have club status or not. It seems to represent minorities on campus that should be represented on students, but women are a majority on campus and still have a representative. The decision whether club status or not should be made by council. The council is the best way to do that. I don't see how this motion is any different from that status.

VP Dooley: No decision of the equity commission will be made without approval by council. Its representation isn't an issue right now, but you are SSMU - you can change the bylaws.

Keresteci: I think that the club would just go through equity committee first and then through council to get its club status back. I yield to the floor.

Bay: Motion to suspend caucus period.

***Motion to suspend caucus period passed.***

Woolf: the position on Equity Committee aren't necessarily be held by members of that minority. It is clear that the overwhelming majority feels that something needs to be done. It is now not about ideas, but about actions. We voted in favor of their formation, but by the time they were approved for full club status, equity complaints were filed. We are here to have discussion about the actions of this club. There are limitations in Canadian and within SSMU law to acceptable limitations of free speech. There is a difference between right to believe something and the right of conduct. Should SSMU decide to do something, there is the question whether the procedural legitimacy of this motion is dubious? There is no precedent for pursuing this motion. Yet, clubs can have their statuses suspended for something as trivial as breaking a postering regulation. Why should we treat Choose Life separately and give them more leeway? Clubs and Services Committee commonly rejects or tables club applications, and in this context, it is not rejected, but it is put into the course of review. Suspension is the most prudent avenue to take. We need to be sure that another Echoes fiasco won't happen whilst reviewing the club. They might promise that it won't, but this is not the first time that they have told us this. Equity Committee is very aware of the issue. We must demonstrate that we must address dilemmas. We know that we are in precedent-setting process. Our coming actions or lack thereof will set a precedent. Our actions should be referred to the committee to consider.

Gagliardi: How long do we have to wait for the issue to be dealt with?

Woolf: We do have quorum, but will probably be getting the last members pretty soon.

VP Brown: Motion to extend speaking time to 5 minutes.

***Motion to extend speaking time to 5 minutes passed.***



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

Bay: This is like the Bush doctrine – USA can declare war on country based on future actions.

VP Ronderos-Morgan: We cannot condemn a club on their future actions, making a decision based on that would be irresponsible. The equity committee can make decision to make no decision – what if they choose not to? It has become a situation where the Choose Life club can be held hostage.

Yu: Motion to extend caucus to 5 minutes.

***Motion to extend caucus to 5 minutes passed.***

Hudak: We have an amendment that was accepted as friendly, as a second “be it resolved” clause: “Be it further resolved that the SSMU Student Equity Committee, in conjunction with Choose Life, draft a document which will be adopted by Choose Life that guides Choose Life in how to abide by the SSMU Constitutions, Bylaws and Policies.”

VP Dooley: I used to be a pro life activist. It is possible to put forward the pro-life opinion without holding a picture of aborted fetuses, it can be done in a cVP Ollegial environment. I think that this can be done in this way. I do believe that all points of view should be represented on campus, but this group hasn’t shown that it can be trusted. You cannot bring students together if you don’t have a safe space. This is why we have an Equity Policy. It is in the mandate of the Equity Committee to advise SSMU council on issues of equity that we cannot agree on. This is why we have to go to the specialists. It is important to acknowledge that we are abiding by the proper guidelines. You are SSMU, you can mandate the committee to give you updates etc. We are debating that we should have safe space for all students. McGill reads our policies in that as long it is a club with all their privileges. Unless we suspend their status now, it makes no difference to McGill. It is due time to go to the proper process.

Omer: Does this amendment mean that by the time the committee completes its evaluation, there will be a feasible model for the club to exist holding this opinion?

VP Dooley: We are hoping to teach Choose Life how to abide by our policies. And we would bring accountability. It will not be perfect, but hopefully better.

Omer: Motion to extend speaking time by 5 minutes.

***Motion to extend speaking time by 5 minutes passed.***



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

VP Dooley: It would be dependent on the compliance of Choose Life and us and Choose Life to come to common ground and them to accept our policies. The goal of this is to make them comply with our policies, but it is very dependent on their conduct.

Shee: Question of procedure: if this is a question of policy run up by Equity Committee, shouldn't it go to J-Board? Wouldn't that be the proper form of motion? It would probably be a better measure.

VP Dooley: We have been telling that to councilors and students, but right now, that is not on the table.

VP Olle: I have been talking to Student Advocacy, and it is not clear whether we could j-board a club, but you can always j-board a council decision.

Shee: Is it being looked at completely equitably?

VP Dooley: If it is a question of equity, it is to go to the Equity Committee.

Keresteci: Motion to extend speaking time by 5 minutes.

***Motion to extend speaking time by 5 minutes passed.***

VP Dooley: I also think that Equity Committee's job is to be objective. It is the mandate of Equity Committee, but one can also j-board the council decision.

Yu: I would like to bring forward a hostile amendment: "Choose Life's club status will be amended until by-laws regarding its conduct will be put forward by Choose Life and approved by council."

***Adoption of amendment failed.***

Khan: Is SSMU against the mandate of Choose Life or against pro life in general? As a member of the C&S committee, we cannot reject them as long as their constitution is okay.

VP Dooley: This council has no stance on the pro-life opinion.

Dara: Is there a possibility that the equity committee could mandate them not to be affiliated with the national organization?

VP Dooley: Everything is possible. If there is anything in their constitution that prevents them from abiding by their bylaws, that will be a possibility to change that.



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

Yu: It would be incredible if there is no action taken. My issue is that it seems that it does not suggest an automatic pathway of asking Choose Life and council to renew their club status. It would be good for the Choose Life club to be proactive and draft a resolution, but they should have a concrete pathway for it. I'm afraid that they are put in a state of unimportance where neither they nor the club come up with a solution.

Elena: Why should Choose Life come up with the suggestions given that they don't feel that they violated the policy and Natalie felt that she didn't see any changes?

Yu: I hope that Choose Life can realize that the council won't leave them walk away without limitations. They would be put into limitations, their proposal would have to satisfy the council, and it would be great for them to show their goodwill.

VP Dooley: Do you not understand or trust the job of Equity Committee – it will make recommendations to that extent.

Yu: I don't have anything against the Equity Committee, but I'm uncomfortable with the process. I'm uncomfortable that there is no clear timeline. I know that you think that it is unreasonable, but I think it would be great with an appropriate timeline.

Dara: My remark is mostly directed to Representative Keresteci: Minority rights are always respected by smaller bodies, like courts, because the majority bodies, like this council, will sometimes rule in the favor of the majority. This is why there are institutions to protect minority rights against 'tyranny of the majority'. People here are not in a perspective to understand the situation of post-abortive women. Please don't underestimate the importance of that issue.

President Neilson: Motion to move to previous question.

***Motion to move to previous question passed.***

Marshall: Move to conduct the vote by secret ballot.

***Motion to vote by secret ballot passed.***

***Resolution Regarding Choose Life's Club Status passed by 16 votes in affirmation and 7 in negation.***



Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

D. \*Resolution Regarding SSMU's Support for the Campaign for Paid Practicum .....

Gucciardi: I would like to table this motion to the next meeting.

***Resolution Regarding SSMU's Support for the Campaign for Paid Practicum tabled.***

VP Olle: Motion to amend the agenda to do the budget now.

Budget Presentation

VP Diaz: You have several documents. We are revising the budget right now. The far right column is last year, the middle was our prospective budget, on the left is revised budget. Some of the numbers are better allocated. I discussed many of the budgets with the people in charge of them. I'll go over it by pieces. SSMU gets 54% of its revenue from fees, from the base fee as well as other club fees. All of them except for the SSMU fee are opt-outable. The only one that is not only funded by the fee is the Tribune, it is also slightly subsidized by McGill. 20,000 students right now are paying the different fees. The opt-outs, we calculated, are about 13%. Here you can see the revenues from different sources of revenue and the expenses by department. General administration includes things like legal fees, insurance, salaries, etc. As for the security budget – SSMU security operates differently from McGill Security. This budget covers agents, equipment, clothing, etc. This department generates revenue when we are running events in the building, and Gerts pays for its own security. As for Operations – those would be the Bookstore, and Gerts. There are breakdowns of the expenses later on. Later, we have the Shatner building, it will include all the costs to run the building. Later, we have governance – this is a lot of what SSMU does in terms of representation: the stipends of executives, the expenses for our General Assembly, the referendums, elections, and all that is under the portfolio of the VP External and the VP UA. Events includes events of VP Internal and C&S. Media and communication is about the handbook, Old McGill, and then there are our clubs and services. My process was as followed: in meetings department by department, we looked at the departments and looked at changes that occurred– for example interest rates went down substantially, but all operations are doing extremely well, better than what we budgeted for. In Haven and Gerts, the deficit was reduced, but we left a lot of resources in the department since there was a lot to be done in the long-run. We analyzed the budgets for every event, and some departments showed surpluses and some deficits. The surplus of events went into the SSPN deficit budget. McGill experienced much higher enrolment than anticipated when we were elaborating the budget, so we thought that there would be less revenue than there was. Also the operations are doing better, we have a bit of a surplus over what was budgeted, that was then reallocated to different departments. We brought back a department called conferences and concerts in order to enhance programming, and clubs traditionally

---

\* Requires leave of the SSMU Legislative Council by a simple majority of votes.





Celebrating over 100 years of SSMU

## Office of the Speaker

---

have been underfunding, so we increased the Clubs Fund to \$75,000, which will allow us to do a lot more, and made minor adjustments to services. We were anticipating a hard year when we made the budget; so, many services got more money. I will stand for questions.

Abaki: I'm a huge fan that you do your stuff, but I would request that we could postpone the question period for next time. It is also in the bylaws that the documents have been sent in advance.

VP Diaz: I would encourage people to ask questions now, I have no problem to wait for 14 days for approval, but would like to give people opportunity to ask questions now.

Bay: You did a great job on Operations. But the advertisement on Gerts has gone up exponentially. And couldn't more have been taken out of CERF?

VP Diaz: For advertisement – we felt it would be nice to increase the amount. We got a good amount of free promo kegs, so we wanted to include those kegs as promo-items. In terms of CERF, not every single capital expenditure that we make comes out of Gerts. Equipment entails a lot of things that is not necessarily a big capital expenditure.

Keresteci: In your opinion, will Gerts and Haven Books ever be in the black?

VP Diaz: If we would like to bring down the deficit of Gerts, we could be increasing our prices. As for Haven, it's not feasible under the current model to break even, this is something to be worked on.

VP Olle: Another question would be whether it is in our interest for operations to break even?

VP Diaz: I see them more as a service than a business. It would be nice for Gerts to break even without putting money on students, I don't think that should be something that we should do. Haven is much more of a service, we are providing a huge service for students to get new textbooks, and I'd rather ensure that whatever we do stays in line with our policies than going for profit.

Woolf: Did you follow up on the idea of a computer repair services?

VP Diaz: We decided not to do it. In our research, we found that there were significant start up costs, it's hard to get qualified people, and since if we fuck something up, we would be liable, the costs were huge.

Bay: Old McGill – why is there a discrepancy of about \$50,000?

VP Diaz: One book came out late, so it went into the next year's budget, in the new fiscal year. The dispute for costs was ongoing until June, so those \$40,000 didn't actually hit our books until this year.



Keresteci: What does MK do with stipends?

Woolf: They are paying their coordinators.

VP Diaz: From all services that receive fees, MK gets the most fees.

Bay: Putting legal fees under publishing costs is misrepresenting what it is.

VP Diaz: It was an invoice that was disputed, it wasn't a legal fee. You have here an operating budget from June to May next year. We close the books in May and call auditors in. if there is any transaction outstanding in the next year, it will enter as something fresh. We can carry on expenses or revenue. Once a year is over, that'll go into the next year.

Wun: What if there is a deficit for services?

VP Diaz: SSMU is giving them a subsidy.

Abaki: I motion to move the approval to next council.

**Motion to move the approval approved.**

E. \*Resolution Regarding the Self-Funded Tuition Model .....

**Hudak: This will be tabled.**

F. \*Resolution Regarding the Use of Styrofoam .....

**Hudak: This will be tabled.**

10. Confidential Session .....

11. Adjournment.....12.30am